

## REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **6 July 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Claims 1, 3-5, 9-10, 12-14, 18-19, 21-23, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gerard et al (USPN 6,442,753, hereinafter “Gerard”). Claims 2, 6-8, 11, 15-17, 20, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerard in view of Li (USPN 5,787,275, hereinafter “Li”). These rejections were maintained in the Advisory Action of **11 August 2005**.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103

Dependent claims 9, 18, and 27 were rejected as being anticipated by Gerard. Applicant respectfully points out that Gerard teaches modifications to a computer system, which includes, inter alia, a cache memory (see Gerard, col. 5, line 5). The cache memory suggested by Gerard is a hardware addition to a memory system for saving **recently used instructions and data** so that the processor can reuse these instructions and data.

In contrast, the present invention provides a cache within the class analyzer that is not part of the memory system and which stores **only the list of dependent classes** including the name of the analyzed class (see FIGs. 2 and 3, and paragraphs [0032], [0034], and [0035] of the instant application). This is different from the system of Gerard, because the system of Gerard stores all recently used instructions and data in the cache, while the present invention stores only data relevant to the analyzed classes. The specialized cache for dependent classes in the present invention is beneficial because it provides the necessary data, and only the necessary data, for looking up class dependencies. There is nothing within Gerard, either explicit or implicit, which suggests providing a cache within the class analyzer that is not part of the memory system and which stores only the list of dependent classes including the name of the analyzed class.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to include the limitations of dependent claims 9, 18, and 27, respectively, to clarify that the present invention provides a cache within the class analyzer that is not part of the memory system and which stores only the list of dependent classes including the name of the analyzed class. These amendments find support in FIGs. 2 and 3, and in paragraphs [0032], [0034], and [0035] of the instant application. Dependent claims 9, 18, and 27 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-17, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-26, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 2 September 2005

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95616-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665